

REMARKS

The present application was filed on September 18, 2000 with claims 1 through 9. Claim 5 was previously canceled in an Office Action Response dated December 18, 2003. Through a restriction requirement, the Examiner withdrew claims 2, 6, 7, and 9. Consequently, claims 1, 3, 4, and 8 are pending. In the present response, Applicants propose to amend independent claims 1, 3 and 8. In the outstanding final Office Action, the Examiner required restriction of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §121 and rejected claims 1, 3, 4 and 8 under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Alperovich et al. (United States Patent Number 5,987,318).

Restriction Requirement

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner required restriction of the application to one of the following two groups of claims: Group I, including claims 1, 3, 4, and 8; and Group II, including claims 2, 6, 7, and 9. The Examiner has withdrawn claims 2, 6, 7, and 9, corresponding to Group II, from consideration.

Applicants respectfully select Group I, claims 1, 3, 4, and 8 for prosecution on the merits.

Independent Claims 1, 3 and 8

Independent claims 1, 3, and 8 were rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Alperovich et al. In particular, the Examiner asserts that Alperovich teaches a network node device connected to one or more wireless connections.

Applicants note that Alperovich teaches that the “serving MSC retrieves the data correlating the first mobile station with the second mobile station, determines that the first mobile station is currently located within the same home zone, and conferences the first mobile station into the existing call connection involving the second mobile station by utilizing one of the call conference circuits.” (See, Abstract.) As is well known in the art, mobile switching centers (MSC’s) are connected to other networks, such as the Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) 90, via *trunk lines* that handle multiples call connections. Independent claims 1, 3, and 8 have been amended to require that the call in progress is carried between said network node and a network via *twisted-pair wirelines*. Support for this amendment can be found on page 17,

lines 9-10 (see, also, FIG. 2; page 1, line 12, to page 2, line 3; page 4, line 12 to page 5, line 6; and page 10, line 9, to page 11, line 18).

Thus, Alperovich et al. do not disclose or suggest that the call in progress is carried between said network node and a network via *twisted-pair wirelines*, as required by independent claims 1, 3, and 8, as amended.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1, 3, and 8 are patentable over Alperovich et al. and request that the §102(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 4

Dependent claim 4 is dependent on independent claim 3 and is therefore patentably distinguished over Alperovich et al. because of its dependency from independent claim 3 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements this claim adds in combination to its base claim.

Conclusion

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1, 3, 4, and 8, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: December 20, 2004

Kevin M. Mason -
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560